

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Arvind Ramaswamy et al.	§	Confirmation No.:	6801
		§		
Serial No.:	10/506,815	§	Group Art Unit:	2446
		§		
Filed:	04/11/2005	§	Examiner:	Farhad Ali
		§		
For:	Method And System For	§	Docket No.:	200601202-5
	A Network Management	§		
	Console	§		

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: November 1, 2010

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated September 1, 2010, Appellants respectfully submit this Reply Brief for further consideration by the Board. Appellants stand behind all arguments made in their main Brief.

On page 20 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner indicates that Ginzboorg "clearly teaches an access list that is retrieved from the router and additionally that the access list is compared with the IP addresses retrieved from a charging server of customers who pay at the moment in question for access to the network." Ginzboorg also discloses that user-operated terminals are given access to a network providing services through connection to an access network and that "access service is offered by connecting the user terminal to the network providing the services through interface elements which connect the access network and the network providing the services" (Ginzboorg Abstract). Thus, one skilled in the art would appreciate that the user-operated terminals that are granted or denied access to the network providing services are not themselves part of the network.

By contrast, the portion of the claimed limitation that the Examiner is addressing on page 20 recites, in part, “a data communication means for periodically polling said agent at said service node and for retrieving a user access list from said agent, said user access list specifying which users have accessed said service node... .” Independent claim 1 further recites, in part, “identifying unauthorized access to a data network service, provided at a **service node in a data network**, by a **user node in said data network**...” (emphasis added). Thus, the user node exists in the same network as the service node providing the data network service. Appellants respectfully submit that Ginzboorg fails to teach or suggest “retrieving a user access list from said agent, said user access list specifying which users have accessed said service node” where the users and the service node are entities within the same network. Independent claims 5, 13 and 18 recite similar limitations and thus Appellants respectfully submit that Ginzboorg fails to teach or suggest the limitations of those claims as well.

Additionally, claim 1 recites, in part, “a database for maintaining an authorized access list for said service node, said authorized access list specifying which users are authorized to access said service node” and “a data processing means for detecting unauthorized access to said service node by comparing said user access list to said authorized access list and for updating said authorized access list based on the user access list retrieved from said agent.” Independent claims 5, 13 and 18 recite similar limitations. As explained above, Ginzboorg’s “user-operated terminals” are not part of the “network providing services.” Thus Appellants respectfully submit that Ginzboorg fails to teach or suggest “an authorized access list for said service node ... specifying which users are authorized to access said service node” where the users and the service node are entities within the same network. Furthermore, Appellants respectfully submit that Ginzboorg fails to teach the other limitations of claims 1, 5, 13 and 18 for similar reasons.

Thus, for at least the reasons given above and those contained in the Appeal Brief, Appellants respectfully submit that Ginzboorg fails to anticipate the presently appealed claims and that Noy fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Ginzboorg.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner erred in rejecting all pending claims. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/

Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
3404 E. Harmony Road
Fort Collins, CO 80528